

Remarks

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 42-48 were allowed, however the Examiner indicated that correction of a minor informality was still necessary. Applicants have amended Claim 42 according to the Examiner's request. Additionally, Applicants have amended Claim 48 to correct a second minor informality.

Amendment to Claim 28

Applicants courteously submit that Claim 28 has been amended to correct a minor grammatical error. Specifically, the word "time" has been amended to be "times".

The Rejection of Claims 28-30 and 33-41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 28-30 and 33-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Patent Application Publication No. WO 90/10935 (*Pons et al.*) in view of United States Patent No. 3,944,473 (*Spaepen et al.*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration for the following reasons.

At the onset, Applicants courteously assert that the parameters recited in Claim 28 are not related to the manner of operation of the claimed apparatus, as they are characteristics of the pulse. Hence, these parameters are entitled to be given patentable weight, contrary to Examiner's assertion on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully assert that *Pons et al.* disclose a conventional electrochemical cell with an anode and a porous cathode, the latter being a standard hydrogen absorptive cathode. The *Pons et al.* process relates to the production of heat while producing hydrogen and oxygen. The *Pons et al.* porous cathode takes up hydrogen by natural absorption, *i.e.*, by dissolving hydrogen in the metal lattices of the cathode. Significantly, *Pons et al.* do not manipulate the cell by applying pulsed voltage, nor do they teach or suggest a plurality of voltage regimes including one for enhancing absorption of hydrogen at the cathode. The Final Office Action at page 3 acknowledges that *Pons et al.* lack a specific disclosure of a second voltage regime

consisting of at least one voltage pulse which is at least two times the voltage of the first cell voltage regime in magnitude with a duration not greater than 0.10 seconds.

It is unclear from reading *Spaepen et al.*, who do not teach either **the use of hydrogen storage cathodes or the electrolysis of water for making hydrogen at the cathode and oxygen at the anode**, what the rationale was for combining with the teachings of *Pons et al.*. The objective of *Spaepen et al.* is to conduct oxidation reactions electrochemically at the anode, **but not with water**. More specifically, *Spaepen et al.* teach applying a potential pulse train for influencing an electrocatalytic reaction proceeding at the electrode, where this reaction is the oxidation of methanol on platinum or the oxidation of hydrogen, hydrazine, or ammonia on an alloy. (*Spaepen et al.*, Col. 1, lines 42-57). Thus, reactions of *Spaepen et al.* include the oxidation of methanol, hydrogen and ammonia using superimposed pulsed voltages which reactions do not lead to the production of oxygen at the anode. **Importantly, *Spaepen et al.* is not at all concerned with the electrolysis of water, as in the case of *Pons et al.***

Spaepen et al. also teach that it was already known to obviate partly some of the aging phenomenons which occur in electrocatalysts by bringing the electrode to another potential. (*Spaepen et al.*, Col. 1, lines 10-15). Applicants respectfully submit that *Spaepen et al.* do not teach that the inventive pulse regime obviates aging phenomenons, only that it was known in the art to obviate these phenomenons by bringing the electrode to another potential. (*Spaepen et al.*, Col. 1, lines 10-15). Additionally, Applicants courteously assert that the Examiner has not identified any reason or suggestion why one of ordinary skill in the art of electrolyzing water would have included the pulsed regime of *Spaepen et al.* in the method of *Pons et al.*, whether used to obviate aging phenomenons or to influence the specified oxidation reactions at the electrode. Thus, the Examiner has failed to identify why *Pons et al.* would have desired obviation of aging phenomenons.

Hence, it appears that *Spaepen et al.* was combined with *Pons et al.* based solely on hindsight in view of Applicants claiming a second voltage regime. "When relying on numerous references or a modification of the prior art, it is incumbent on the examiner to identify some suggestion to combine references or make the modification." *In re Mayne*, 104 F.3d 1339, 1342,

41 U.S.P.Q.2d 1451, 1454 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In fact, it is well settled that before a conclusion of obviousness may be made based on a combination of references, there must have been a reason, suggestion, or motivation to lead the inventors to combine those references. *See Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1568,1573, 37 U.S.P.Q.2d 1626, 1629 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Unless there is some suggestion, teaching or rational in the prior art itself, it is impermissible within the framework of 35 U.S.C. § 103 to combine references based on hindsight from a prior reading of applicants' own disclosure. Indeed, "to imbue one of ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of the invention...when no prior art reference or references of record convey or suggest that knowledge, is to fall victim to the insidious effect of a hindsight syndrome wherein that which only the inventor taught is used against its teacher." *In Re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Applicants courteously submit that there is simply no perceived basis for combining the disclosures of *Pons et al.* with those of *Spaepen et al.*. **The objectives of *Pons et al.* and *Spaepen et al.* do not converge.**

Applicants courteously submit that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences has previously considered the combination of *Pons et al.* and *Spaepen et al.*, during the prosecution of the parent case, *i.e.*, United States Patent Application No. 08/334,952 which issued as United States Patent No. 6,638,413 on October 28, 2003. Although the instant application is directed at an apparatus and the parent application is directed at a method, the motivation to combine *Pons et al.* and *Spaepen et al.*, as described by the Examiner, is the same and has been previously struck down by the Board. Hence, Applicants have included a copy of the Board decision on Appeal No. 1999-0928 as an appendix in this reply. Applicants respectfully assert that pages 13-15 of the Board decision set forth reasons why *Pons et al.* and *Spaepen et al.* cannot be combined in accordance with the Examiner's assertions.

Even assuming *arguendo* that *Pons et al.* and *Spaepen et al.* could be combined, which they can not, Applicants' claimed invention would still not be arrived at. In this regard, *Spaepen et al.* disclose at Column 1, lines 10-19:

“ It is already known to obviate partly some of the ageing [sic] phenomenons which occur in existing electro-catalysts by bringing temporally the catalyst-forming electrode to another potential. This does not provide better electrocatalytic action but only partially restores the original catalytic action.

The duration of the pulses used is rather long and lies in the range of seconds to minutes, while the working time between pulses lies in the range of minutes to hours.” (emphasis added)

According to Applicants' Claim 28, the second cell voltage regime consists of at least one pulse with a voltage which is at least two times greater than the first cell voltage regime, and runs for a period **not exceeding 0.1 seconds**. Thus, Applicants' claimed pulses consist of **very short bursts of high voltage** compared to those of *Spaepen et al.*, who teach overcoming the aging phenomenon with lengthy pulses running for **seconds to minutes**. Accordingly, while *Spaepen et al.* teach a second voltage regime, the duration of the pulses according to *Spaepen et al.* for the utility of overcoming the aging phenomenon is many times greater than the pulse duration of Applicants' claimed invention. Once again, Applicants' claimed pulses **may not exceed 0.1 seconds**, and is usually measured in **nanoseconds**, i.e., one billionth of a second. (See for example Applicants' Claim 29).

Accordingly, even if *Spaepen et al.* teach a second voltage regime used in electrocatalytic reactions as urged in the Office Action, the claims under examination would still not be arrived at in view of the fact that the pulsed voltages suggested by this reference far exceed the maximum duration permitted by Applicants' claims.


Applicants' courteously submit, in view of the above remarks, the rejection of Claims 28-30 and 33-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pons et al.* in view of *Spaepen et al.* cannot stand, and should be withdrawn.

Attorney Docket No.: ESP:106eUS
Appl. No. 10/643,344
Amdt. dated October 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2006

Conclusion

For all the reasons outlined above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over the cited references and in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Howard M. Ellis', is written over the typed name.

Howard M. Ellis
Registration No. 25,856
CUSTOMER NO. 24041
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC
5555 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406
Telephone No. 716-626-1564
Facsimile No. 716-626-0366

HME/RCA
Dated: October 31, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: ESP:106eUS
Appl. No. 10/643,344
Amdt. dated October 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2006

Appendix

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 29




UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte NORMAN L. WEINBERG, KLAUS TOMANTSCHGER,
ROBERT S. FELDSTEIN,
J. DAVID GENDERS and JOSEPH M. RAIT

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

ON BRIEF



Before OWENS, WALTZ, and JEFFREY T. SMITH, **Administrative Patent Judges.**

WALTZ, **Administrative Patent Judge.**

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on an appeal from the primary examiner's final rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6 through 12, 14 through 27, 33, 34, 36 and 37.¹ The remaining claims pending in this application (claims 3, 5, 13 and 35) stand withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner as directed to a non-elected

¹ An amendment after final rejection was entered by the examiner and amended claim 27 but no claims were indicated as allowable (see the amendment dated Jan. 20, 1998, Paper No. 16, entered as per the Advisory Action dated Jan. 26, 1998, Paper No. 17).

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

invention. See 37 CFR § 1.142(b). We have jurisdiction pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 134.

According to appellants, the invention is directed to a method for the electrolysis of water for enhanced production of oxygen, hydrogen and heat by the application of a unique repeating sequence of voltages (Brief, pages 2 and 4).

Illustrative independent claim 1 is reproduced below:

1. A method for electrolyzing water to produce oxygen, hydrogen and heat which comprises the steps of:

(i) providing an electrochemical cell comprising an isotopic hydrogen storage cathode, an electrically conductive anode and an ionically conducting electrolyte comprising water, and

(ii) impressing a repeating sequence of voltages across said cathode and anode comprised of at least two cell voltage regimes, a first cell voltage regime consisting of a voltage sufficient to enhance cathodic absorption of hydrogen, and a second cell voltage regime consisting of at least one voltage pulse which is at least 2 times the voltage of the first cell voltage regime for a total duration no greater than 0.10 seconds.

A list of the prior art relied upon by the examiner as evidence of unpatentability may be found on pages 4-5 of the Answer. The following grounds of rejection are presented for our review in this appeal:

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

(1) the claims on appeal stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. § 101, for failing to provide an enabling disclosure due to the lack of utility and operativeness (Answer, pages 5 and 13);

(2) the claims on appeal stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite (Answer, page 11);

(3) claims 1, 2, 6-12, 14-18, 21-24, 27, 33, 34 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Horvath (*id.*);

(4) the claims on appeal stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Pons in combination with Spaepen and the admitted prior art (as evidenced by Mazur, Saito, Greenberg, or Suzuki, as disclosed on page 10 of the specification) (*id.*);
and

(5) claims 1, 2, 6-12, 14-22, 33, 34, 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Timewell in combination with either Sobieralski or Pons (Answer, page 12).

We reverse all of the examiner's rejections on appeal essentially for the reasons set forth in the Brief, Reply Brief and as stated below.

OPINION

A. *The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2*

A proper analysis of patentability should begin with the second paragraph of section 112, proceed to the first paragraph, and then analyze the prior art applied against the claimed subject matter under sections 102 and 103. See *In re Angstadt*, 537 F.2d 498, 501, 190 USPQ 214, 217 (CCPA 1976).

The examiner states that, in claim 1, line 2, it remains "unclear" whether the term "heat" constitutes "excess heat" (Answer, page 11). Therefore the examiner concludes that the "metes and bounds" of the claims are undefined (*id.*). However, the initial burden of establishing unpatentability, on any ground, rests with the examiner. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The legal standard for definiteness of claim language is whether a claim reasonably apprises those of skill in the art of its scope, when read in light of the specification. See *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1361, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1759 (Fed. Cir. 1994); and *In re Angstadt*, *supra*.

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

The examiner has failed to meet the initial burden in that no reasoning has been presented why the term "heat" would not reasonably apprise those of ordinary skill in this art of its scope (e.g., see Horvath, col. 11, ll. 4-26). The examiner has also failed to present any reasons why one of ordinary skill in this art, upon reading the specification, would be "unclear" whether "heat" includes "excess heat" (Answer, page 11). The term "heat," used in its normal and accepted art-recognized meaning, would include any production of heat energy, whether small or "excess" (Brief, page 22; specification, page 2, ll. 16-31, and pages 22-23).

For the foregoing reasons and those stated in the Brief and Reply Brief, we determine that the examiner has failed to establish that the claimed subject matter in question would not have reasonably apprised one of ordinary skill in this art of the scope of the claims. Accordingly, the rejection based on the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is reversed.

B. The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and § 112, ¶1

The questions of whether a specification provides an enabling disclosure under § 112, ¶1, and whether an application

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

satisfies the utility requirement of § 101 are closely related and thus we treat these two rejections together. See *In re Swartz*, 232 F.3d 862, 863, 56 USPQ2d 1703, 1703 (Fed. Cir. 2000). To satisfy the enablement requirement of § 112, ¶1, the patent application must adequately disclose the claimed subject matter so as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention at the time the application was filed without undue experimentation. See *Swartz, supra*. The utility requirement of § 101 mandates that the invention be operable to achieve useful results. See *Swartz*, 232 F.3d at 863, 56 USPQ2d at 1703-04. "Thus, if the claims in an application fail to meet the utility requirement because the invention is inoperative, they also fail to meet the enablement requirement because a person skilled in the art cannot practice the invention." *Swartz*, 232 F.3d at 863, 56 USPQ2d at 1704.

The examiner states that appellants' invention "falls into the 'cold fusion' category of alleged low temperature nuclear fusion/transformation reactions and 'excess heat' generation." Answer, page 5. The examiner further states that "[a]bsent

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

evidence of the 'excess heat' generated at the indicated levels (570%) being from chemical reactions or merely lattice induced vibrations, then it follows that the excess heat is from alleged nuclear reactions of the 'cold fusion' system type." Answer, sentence bridging pages 5-6. The examiner finds that cold fusion systems involve decreasing the interatomic spacing between hydrogen isotopes in the host lattice to generate excess heat, such as disclosed by appellants, "regardless of any other name they may be given." Answer, page 6. The examiner considers appellants' invention as being based on the "cold fusion" concept set forth by Pons and Fleischmann and then discusses numerous references that refute this concept (Answer, pages 6-7). Accordingly, the examiner believes that a reasonable and sufficient basis has been set forth for challenging the adequacy of the disclosure, with a showing that claims of nuclear fusion and/or excess heat generation are not reproducible or even obtainable (Answer, page 10). We disagree.

The examiner has the initial burden of challenging an appellants' presumptively correct assertion of utility. See

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

Swartz, 232 F.3d at 864, 56 USPQ2d at 1704. "If the PTO provides evidence showing that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt the asserted utility, however, the burden shifts to the applicant to submit evidence sufficient to convince such a person of the inventions's asserted utility." Swartz, 232 F.3d 864, 56 USPQ2d at 1704, underlining added. Appellants do not, on this record, assert a utility involving "cold fusion" (Brief, page 10). The examiner makes the assertion that appellants' invention involves "cold fusion" (Answer, pages 5-11). The claims, as represented by claim 1 above, are directed to a method for electrolyzing water to produce oxygen, hydrogen and heat. The specification is only directed to this utility, i.e., the electrolysis of water to produce oxygen, hydrogen and heat (see the specification, page 1, ll. 8-11; and page 2, ll. 32-35). The examiner has not presented any evidence or reasoning to show that the asserted utility of electrolyzing water to produce oxygen, hydrogen and heat is inoperative or not obtainable. In fact, the examiner has applied prior art (Horvath) that shows the electrolysis of water with the production of oxygen, hydrogen and heat (see Horvath, col. 11, ll. 4-26; Reply Brief, page 3).

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

Therefore appellants have provided a credible utility for the claimed subject matter and thus satisfy the utility requirement of § 101.

Similarly, the examiner has provided no basis or support for the assertion that the specification disclosure is non-enabling. Appellants have provided a schematic diagram and an example disclosing how to make and use the claimed invention (Brief, pages 17-21; specification, pages 15-25). The examiner's citation of numerous references that refute claims to "cold fusion" show that "cold fusion" would not occur without the production of tritium, neutrons, helium-4 and gamma rays (see, for example, Hilts, Chapline, Lewis, Alber, Faller, Hajdas, Ziegler, and Jones). The examiner has not cited any disclosure or allegation by appellants that such by-products of "cold fusion" have been produced. As discussed above, the examiner has not shown that appellants are claiming or alleging that their method involves "cold fusion."² See Swartz, 232 F.3d at 864, 56

² On page 14 of the Answer, the examiner asserts that "appellants have also admitted that the heat may be generated by 'cold fusion'," referring to page 6 of the amendment dated Sep. 2, 1997 (Paper No. 14). However, these remarks by appellants are not an allegation that "cold fusion" occurs during their method but merely an assertion that the term "heat" includes any heat produced even if it might be generated by "cold fusion." See Paper No. 14, page 6.

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

USPQ2d at 1704 ("In his written description and throughout prosecution of his application, Mr. Swartz continually represented his invention as relating to cold fusion.").

The only evidence the examiner presents is that appellants disclose that "excess heat" is sometimes generated by their method but appellants offer no explanation for this observation (Answer, page 14; Brief, page 11; specification, pages 23 and 25). However, the claims are limited to the production of "heat" (see claim 1 above) and the observation of "excess heat" in some examples is not sufficient and convincing evidence that "cold fusion" is involved in the claimed method. See Hilts, where it is disclosed that the amount of heat produced depends on the amount of electrical power put into the process, and "excess" heat is only an excess over what the appellants assume they should get. Thus incorrect assumptions by appellants could result in the production of "excess heat." See also Kreysa, where the "excess heat" production of Pons and Fleischmann is attributed to the catalytic recombination of hydrogen and oxygen (page 441, last paragraph). Furthermore, see Ohashi, where

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

evidence of excess heat production without a relationship to concomitant production of neutrons, tritium, and helium, was explained by considering a recombination of hydrogen and oxygen evolved during the experiment, not by categorizing the experiment as "cold fusion" (page 729). Finally, Jones teaches that the production of excess heat generation during water electrolysis "could be readily terminated by the introduction of various barriers to the migration of hydrogen and oxygen" and that "[t]here is no compelling evidence that excess heat is of a nuclear origin in such electrolytic cells." Jones, page 6973, abstract. Therefore, on this record, the examiner has not presented any evidence that appellants' generation of "excess heat" during electrolysis of water is of a nuclear origin or that appellants' invention should be categorized as "cold fusion" but, on the contrary, the evidence of record supports the opposite view when "excess heat" is the only by-product of the electrolysis.

For the foregoing reasons and those stated in the Brief and Reply Brief, we determine that the examiner has not met the initial burden of presenting evidence to support that the claimed

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

subject matter is inoperative or lacks enabling disclosure. Accordingly, we cannot sustain the examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and § 112, first paragraph.

C. The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The examiner finds that Horvath discloses a method comprising an electrolysis cell having an isotopic hydrogen storage cathode, an anode, and an electrolyte comprising water, with voltage sequences including a voltage pulse (Answer, page 11, citing col. 10, l. 60-col. 11, l. 26, and col. 13, l. 59 - col. 14, l. 5).

Under § 102(b), anticipation or lack of novelty requires that the prior art reference discloses, either expressly or under the principles of inherency, every limitation of the claim. See *In re King*, 801 F.2d 1324, 1326, 231 USPQ 136, 138 (Fed. Cir. 1986). From the examiner's findings noted above, there is no explanation as to why the "voltage pulse" of Horvath describes the claimed limitation of at least two cell voltage regimes, with the first voltage enhancing cathodic absorption of hydrogen while the second voltage is at least two times as large as the first voltage and has a duration no greater than 0.10 seconds (e.g.,

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

see claim 1 on appeal). Accordingly, we cannot sustain the examiner's rejection under section 102(b) since the examiner has not found every limitation of the claims described by the reference.

D. The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

There are two rejections based on section 103 before us in this appeal. In the first rejection, the examiner combines Pons and Spaepen (along with the "admitted prior art") (Answer, page 11). The examiner finds that Pons discloses the same method as claimed but "lacks a specific showing of superimposing voltage regimes" (Answer, page 12). Therefore the examiner applies Spaepen for the disclosure of superimposing a high voltage pulse regime on to a low voltage regime to obviate ageing phenomena (*id.*). From these findings, the examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to include superimposing voltage regimes in the method of Pons, as taught by Spaepen, to have "enhanced curing ageing phenomena" (*id.*).

"When relying on numerous references or a modification of the prior art, it is incumbent upon the examiner to identify some suggestion to combine references or make the modification." In

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

re *Mayne*, 104 F.3d 1339, 1342, 41 USPQ2d 1451, 1454 (Fed. Cir. 1997). It is well settled that before a conclusion of obviousness may be made based on a combination of references, there must have been a reason, suggestion, or motivation to lead the inventors to combine those references. See *Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1568, 1573, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1629 (Fed. Cir. 1996). The examiner has found that Pons is directed to electrolyzing water to produce hydrogen, oxygen and heat using an isotopic hydrogen storage cathode, an anode, and an aqueous electrolyte (Answer, pages 11-12). However, the examiner has failed to note that Spaepen is directed to another type of electrolysis, namely that Spaepen teaches applying a potential pulse train for influencing an electrocatalytic reaction proceeding at the electrode, where this reaction is the oxidation of methanol on platinum or the oxidation of hydrogen, hydrazine, or ammonia on an alloy (Spaepen, col. 1, ll. 42-67). Spaepen teaches that it was already known to obviate partly some of the ageing phenomenons which occur in electrocatalysts by bringing the electrode to another potential (col. 1, ll. 10-15). First, contrary to the examiner's proposed motivation (Answer, pages 12

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

and 15), Spaepen does not teach that the inventive pulsed regime obviates ageing phenomenons, only that it was known in the art to obviate these phenomenons by bringing the electrode to another potential (see col. 1, ll. 10-15). Secondly, the examiner has not identified any reason or suggestion why one of ordinary skill in the art of electrolyzing water would have included the pulsed regime of Spaepen in the method of Pons, whether used to obviate ageing phenomenons or to influence the specified oxidation reactions at the electrode (see the Brief, page 25). The examiner has failed to identify why Pons would have desired obviation of ageing phenomenons.

The "admitted prior art" (Answer, pages 11-12) has been applied by the examiner to show that it was well known in this art to have an electrolysis cell with an ion-exchange membrane divider. Therefore these references do not remedy the deficiency noted above.

For the foregoing reasons and those set forth in the Brief and Reply Brief, we determine that the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in view of the reference evidence. Accordingly, we cannot sustain the

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Pons in combination with Spaepen and the "admitted prior art."

With regard to the second rejection based on section 103, the examiner finds that Timewell "substantially discloses the claimed invention," lacking only a specific showing of an isotopic hydrogen storage cathode (Answer, page 12). Therefore the examiner applies Sobieralski or Pons to show that isotopic hydrogen storage materials (e.g., palladium) are known in the art to be equivalent to aluminum for use as a cathode (Answer, paragraph bridging pages 12-13). Accordingly, the examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to have substituted an isotopic hydrogen storage material for the aluminum cathode of Timewell (Answer, page 13).

Assuming *arguendo* that Timewell discloses all limitations of the claimed subject matter except the use of an isotopic hydrogen storage cathode, we do not agree with the examiner that the secondary references disclose the equivalency of palladium and aluminum in the art of electrolyzing water and therefore there is no suggestion or motivation for the examiner's proposed

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

modification or substitution. See *In re Mayne, supra*; and *Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc., supra*.

Timewell is directed to a method and apparatus for electrically conditioning electrode means positioned in an electrolyte (see col. 2, ll. 21-24). Timewell discloses use of a saltwater electrolyte with production of hydrogen at the cathode and relatively little oxygen at the depassivated anode (col. 3, ll. 28-31; col. 4, ll. 49-66). Pons, as previously discussed, is directed to the electrolysis of water to produce hydrogen, oxygen and heat but the examiner has failed to identify any portion of Pons that teaches the equivalency of aluminum and palladium as isotopic hydrogen storage cathodes (see the Answer, page 13, citing page 32 of Pons). Sobieralski is directed to the production of zinc powder from the electrolysis of lead-containing zinc halide solutions (abstract; col. 2, ll. 25-32). The cathode materials disclosed by Sobieralski are taught to be equivalents since they do "not detrimentally effect the operation of the process or the properties of the produced zinc to an intolerable extent." See col. 4, ll. 65-68. The examiner has not identified any reason, suggestion or motivation as to why one

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

of ordinary skill in the art of electrolyzing water would have used the teaching of Sobieralski regarding the equivalency of cathode materials in the production of zinc and substituted these equivalents in the process of Timewell. Furthermore, the examiner has not presented any evidence or reasoning why one of ordinary skill in this art would have substituted an isotopic hydrogen storage cathode for the aluminum of Timewell, when there is no evidence on this record that aluminum is an isotopic hydrogen storage material (see the Brief, page 30).


For the foregoing reasons and those stated in the Brief and Reply Brief, we determine that the examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness in view of the reference evidence. Accordingly, we reverse the examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Timewell in combination with either Sobieralski or Pons.


Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952


E. Summary

All of the rejections on appeal have been reversed.
Therefore the decision of the examiner to reject the claims on
appeal is reversed.

REVERSED


TERRY J. OWENS)
Administrative Patent Judge)


THOMAS A. WALTZ)
Administrative Patent Judge)


JEFFREY T. SMITH)
Administrative Patent Judge)

BOARD OF PATENT
APPEALS AND
INTERFERENCES

taw/vsh

Appeal No. 1999-0928
Application No. 08/334,952

HOWARD M. ELLIS
SIMPSON & SIMPSON, PLLC
5555 MAIN STREET
WILLIAMSVILLE, NY 14221